

**Proposal:** Special Recreation Permit (SRP) BITD Parker 250 Desert Race  
**EA#:** DNA-AZ-070-03-10  
**SRP#** AZ-070-03-02

---

**Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA  
Adequacy (DNA)**

U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

---

**A. Describe the Proposed Action**

The proposed action is to permit the 2003 Best in the Desert Parker (BITD) 250 Desert Race. The scheduled dates for this permit are January 3-5, 2003. A Public Land Closure will coincide with these dates. The event would occur on Saturday and Sunday, January 4 and 5, 2003. The course will be on the designated Parker 400 course as shown on the attached map. This event is the motorcycles and ATV type vehicles and would utilize the portion of the course turning at the Midway Pit location. The Butler Valley, Graham Well, and Bouse, portions would not be used.

**B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance**

LUP Name\* Yuma District RMP Date Approved August, 1986

\* List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans and activity, project, management, or program plans, or applicable amendments thereto)

/ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Yuma District RMP

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

---

**C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.**

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.  
The proposed activity falls within the same environmental scope and setting analyzed in Environmental Assessment AZ-070-01-037, Parker 400 course, number of events per

annum and approved in a Decision Record on 01/17/02, a new Environmental Assessment is not necessary. This is the first of 2 events authorized in the referenced EA for each annual season of use.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

#### **D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

**1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. The current proposed action is the same type of action as previously analyzed in the referenced EA-AZ-070-01-037.

**2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. There were 3 alternatives listed in the referenced NEPA document. The primary use area of the referenced document is the Shea Road Pit and spectator areas, which historically have been used over 20 times as the main pit area and spectator areas of the Parker 400 Desert Race and authorizes use by up to 400 vehicles and participants.

**3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. The analysis undertaken in the referenced EA is still valid. There have been no additions to any of the listing of “Critical Elements of the Human Environment” which are required to be addressed. No relevant new information or circumstances have been identified.

**4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the methodology and analytical approach used in the referenced EA continues to be appropriate. With the current and historical use of the area the opportunity for significant and/or any additional adverse impacts are minimal.

**5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action are unchanged from the referenced EA. Which analyzes impacts related to the proposed action, and that this applies to the designated routes of the Parker 400 course and shown on the attached map.

**6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. Any cumulative impacts would be the same as those analyzed in the referenced EA. The existing EA determination is that issuing an SRP would not result in a significant overall increase in visitation on public lands.

**7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. Public involvement was addressed and included in the existing NEPA document and authorizing recreational use of the proposed area was very supportive

**E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:** Identify those team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this worksheet.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
<u>Myron McCoy</u>	<u>Outdoor Recreation Planner</u>
<u>Cathy Wolff-White</u>	<u>Planning and Environmental Coordinator</u>
<u>Sarah Cunkelman</u>	<u>Archaeologist</u>
<u>Christine Bates</u>	<u>Wildlife Biologist</u>
<u>Lonna O'Neal</u>	<u>Acting Field Manager</u>
<u>Cindy Barnes</u>	<u>Range Specialist</u>

### **Conclusion**

/ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA

Note: If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.

---

Signature of the Responsible Official

---

Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appeal able decision.